

**TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN**  
**Summary of Written Comments Received**  
**Between January 31, 2008 and Close of Record, April 11, 2008**

| Name   | Summary of Comment   |
|--|--|
| <p>Barbara Sears<br/>Linowes and Blocher<br/>LLP on behalf of<br/>AvalonBay<br/>Communities, 12720<br/>Twinbrook Parkway</p> | <p>AvalonBay – impact on circulation on Ardennes Avenue. Will require all residents to exit onto Twinbrook Parkway via the full movement Twinbrook Parkway access – will limit traffic southbound on Ardennes and limit AB resident traffic on residential neighborhood streets.</p> <p>50-foot buffer – if City permits, AvalonBay has offered to reforest the 50-foot buffer with stronger trees and or have the buffer professionally landscaped.</p> <p>Demographics – in the mid-Atlantic area the average AB resident is between 35-36 years old with an annual income of approximately \$84,000. AB communities in the mid-Atlantic average fewer than 3% school-age children – estimate that AB Twinbrook will generate fewer than 8 children annually. AB will be required to pay the MoCo school improvements impact of \$4127 per non-MPDU unit. AB also strictly enforces limit of no more than two people per bedroom. Based on current market trends AB currently anticipating an average rent of \$1700 per month. When completed anticipates individual rents from \$1050/studio to \$2200/two-bedroom unit. AB has committed that 12.5% of its 240, or a minimum of 30 units will be MPDUs.</p> |
| <p>John Cunningham</p>   | <p>Fully support draft concepts for redevelopment of Veirs Mill Road commercial area as a mixed use neighborhood center. Am 30 years old, lived in Rockville whole life and own home in Twinbrook. Shopping centers on VMR an eyesore and avoid them because of their rundown appearance, loitering and possible crime, although would prefer to shop as close to home as possible. Changing the shopping centers to a mixed-use development similar to the Rockville Town Center would revitalize the neighborhood.</p>   |
| <p>Joseph C. McClane<br/>Chair TNPAG</p>   | <p>At March 12 Planning Commission meeting call for public comments on TNP was repeated. As Chair of TNPAG have attended meetings for approximately three years – concerned that long period discourages public participation. TNP often last on the agenda. TNP process involved the most extensive outreach in Twinbrook history – there will always be contrary opinions in such a diverse community but this truly is “Twinbrook’s” plan. Rockville has fair share of public scolds who always have an opinion; this plan was developed with support of the broader community. Planning Commission should keep in mind plan was developed by and for people of Twinbrook. Expedite process while remaining true to the wishes of the community – ensure we have an effective master plan sooner rather than later.</p>   |
| <p>Rebecca D. Walker<br/>Miles &amp; Stockbridge</p>   | <p>Represents owners of 5946 Halpine Road, currently a lawful non-conforming use. Property owners strongly object to Plan recommendations regarding their property, which would significantly reduce its value, even for those uses permitted in the R-60 zone. Ask that property not be limited by unnecessary site-specific</p>  |

**TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN**  
**Summary of Written Comments Received**  
**Between January 31, 2008 and Close of Record, April 11, 2008**

| Name                             | Summary of Comment  |
|----------------------------------|---|
|                                  | recommendation. If site specific deemed necessary recommend acknowledge non-conforming use and reconfirm R-60 zoning.   |
| Dean Fiala<br>TNPAG              | After a long and open process the TNPAG delivered a very balanced and thoughtful vision. Chagrined that Planning Commission continued to dilly-dally under pretense of seeking more involvement and outreach. Plenty of opportunities for comment. Nothing new, much less constructive, has been added since the plan was delivered to you. To allow the process to be captured by those pushing narrow agendas greatly devalues the work of the much broader group of citizens that drafted the plan. Does not encourage civic participation if the committees you create are ignored. Please bring this to a resolution.  |
| Paula Square Waterman<br>TNPAG   | Thank Mr. Fiala for his timely comments. The most discouraging thing about this was the way my ethics, honesty, intelligence and ability to think/act independently were questioned. Would not mind respectful disagreement. From the beginning TNPAG acknowledged there might be disagreements and made provision for them to be included in the report. Unfortunately others do not appear to respect differing opinions: they came to disrupt and hijack the process. Their attitude was “my way or the highway” – they would destroy rather than disagree. Using such methods while trying to expand community involvement will have the opposite effect.   |
| Sandra Connor<br>TNPAG           | Sorely disappointed in the way Planning Commission is dragging its feet on passing this plan. Come on and vote already.   |
| Denise Fredericks<br>TNPAG       | Sad to note apparent success of a few vocal opponents in attempting to dismiss two years of TNPAG work. The draft TNP has achieved a balance that is perhaps more difficult in our neighborhood than in others in Rockville. It acknowledges our place in the City, recognizes our changing environment and sets reasonable goals to preserve our neighborhood “feel.” We recognize our older neighbors need senior services nearer their homes and our middle school students need oversight and activities. Adjacent redevelopment presents significant challenges. We’re bordered by some of the busiest roads in the City and recent increases in criminal activity remind us we’re not a small town but an urbanizing area.<br>TNPAG painstakingly addressed all of these issues, and many more, in our draft plan. The Mayor and Council should approve it. The draft plan was developed by neighbors, recognizes that we’re in the 21 <sup>st</sup> century, sets goals and priorities to protect and preserve the neighborhood and establishes a vision of the place we want to live. |
| Pam Fagelson<br>Vice Chair TNPAG | Have sat through your recent meetings and listened with distress to what sounds like your attempts to rewrite our product. Nearly three years ago the TNPAG came together and listened, learned, discussed, struggled, debated and compromised to come up with the TNP. It is a good plan   |

**TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN**  
**Summary of Written Comments Received**  
**Between January 31, 2008 and Close of Record, April 11, 2008**

| Name  | Summary of Comment  |
|---|---|
|   | that has stood up to repeated requests for more and more input. Please accept it as written and recommend it to the Council. The misery of these protracted efforts will surely prevent many fine Twinbrook residents from participating in future efforts. I am unlikely to volunteer again.   |
| Linda Bozzonetti<br>TNPAG   | Beg you to move plan forward with all speed. TNPAG appointed by Mayor and Council three years ago – our opinions and views must have been respected to ask us to serve in this capacity. Vocal minority in Twinbrook attempting to sway your decision on a few points that they disagree with TNPAG on. Please be assured silent majority exists: have spoken of the plan at numerous community meetings – many thought TNP was fine but didn't have time to attend meetings or write letters. By considering re-writing our plan and relieving us of our responsibilities you devalue our work. This discourages participation in the democratic process. Will never participate in another process.   |
| William Nickel  | Re: The Taylor property 5946 Halpine Road. Residential zone with non-conforming use. Large quantities of debris kept there. Fence in terrible condition. Why isn't code enforcement stricter?<br>Property conditions represent serious safety hazards to the public. Rusted shed open. Locked security gate, but with large gap at the bottom of gate that could be easily crawled under. Cambridge Walk I owners concerned about deteriorating property values due to the Taylor property. Anecdotal evidence shows this negative externality reducing housing values in CW1 by over \$25,000. The status quo is no longer acceptable.   |
| Joseph C. McClane<br>President Cambridge Walk II HOA, Chair TNPAG | Represent two groups with an interest in TNP. Regarding 5946 Halpine Road: TNPAG's thinking was that this has been a non-conforming property for decades and, as there is very little green space in the area, it would make a good site for a pocket park.<br>Amortization of the property would be a fair and effective method. Our community has been concerned for a long time about the negative effect the present use has: home prices in CW II are well into the \$600k, while homes in CW I that back onto 5946 Halpine are much tougher to sell in the low \$500ks, although they are essentially identical homes. Potential buyers say they do not want a home backing up to a property covered with construction debris and rusted machinery. No one wants to see the owners at a financial loss but many more neighbors are losing tens of thousands of dollars in the value of their homes. |
| John and Thea Miles   | We are members of Cambridge Walk I HOA and are writing in reference to the Taylor property at 5946 Halpine Road. We believe that the current non-conforming use should be discontinued as soon as possible, and that a small park would enhance the appeal, use and safety of the entire area.  |
| Anne M. Savelli Oliver  | Live across Halpine Road from the Taylor property. The neighborhood has changed during the past 32 years, for the better in many cases, but the Taylor property remains an eyesore and is deteriorating. It is also   |

**TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN**  
**Summary of Written Comments Received**  
**Between January 31, 2008 and Close of Record, April 11, 2008**

| Name  | Summary of Comment   |
|---|--|
|   | potentially dangerous. The Suburban propane property was eventually cleared making the area much safer for pedestrians. Further deterioration of the Taylor property will bring more negative impacts to the area.   |
| Peter B. Silverman  | The current use of the Taylor property is unattractive and detracts from the neighborhood and diminishes the value of adjacent properties. The unimproved Taylor property is on the tax rolls at less than the improved lot of any one of the townhouses, despite being ten times as large and used for commercial purposes (so much for equitable property taxes.) My wife and I think that the best use for the Taylor property would be townhouses similar to those adjacent to it.   |
| Brian and Danette Lilja   | The Taylor property is directly adjacent to our western property line. As adjacent owners, we have a vested interest in the future of this property. It has a negative impact on our quality of life and the value of our own property. The Taylor property is poorly maintained and potentially dangerous: fence is too low and broken in places, offering access to the fuel storage tanks and other hazards present on the property. The Planning Commission has the opportunity to turn a community liability into an asset. We support a pocket park: currently no park in this area of the City and the need for open space is going to become more acute with the development of Twinbrook Station. The time has come to place the needs of the community over the desires of a single individual.  |
| John Miles - Treasurer,<br>John Hodgson –<br>Secretary, and Brian Lilja<br>– Board Member<br>Cambridge Walk I HOA | Our HOA has a vested interest in the future of the Taylor property. It has a direct impact on our quality of life and the value of our properties. The heavy equipment, diesel and asphalt are daily nuisances. The site is poorly maintain and not secured, making it relatively easy to gain access to the hazardous materials stored there.<br>Homes in CW II are selling in the \$600,000 range, while homes in CW I that back on to the Taylor property are selling in the low \$500,000 although the homes are virtually identical. Potential homebuyers feedback cites the Taylor property as the reason. Not only do those with homes immediately adjacent to the Taylor property lose value, but the greater Twinbrook community's home values also suffer. The Planning Commission has the opportunity to turn this area into a community asset. We favor a pocket park. |
| Henrietta V. Gomez and<br>Michael R. Schneible  | We chose our home on Marcia Lane in 1990 because of the character and open feeling of the area. Our first choice would be that the area remains the same. We have two concerns: Mansionization and traffic. The proposed zoning change of 32 feet maximum height measured at the roof peak and continuing the front and back set backs should control large additions. The FAR of 0.35 or 3,000 square feet should be the maximum and a smaller allowance would be better. A traffic study should be completed if the Forest and Woods Edge apartment complexes are later redeveloped. More traffic would cause gridlock on Twinbrook Parkway.   |

**TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN**  
**Summary of Written Comments Received**  
**Between January 31, 2008 and Close of Record, April 11, 2008**

| Name  | Summary of Comment  |
|---|---|
| Rebecca D. Walker<br>Miles & Stockbridge                            | <p>Firm represents the owners of 5946 Halpine Road. We maintain the current TNP language is inappropriate for the Site, and serves to create a disincentive for redevelopment of the existing non-conforming use. Understand that there is a considerable amount of discord in the community regarding the property. However, it is a lawful use and the owners should not be disproportionately singled out by an unfavorable and property devaluing recommendation in the TNP because the community would prefer to see something else on the site. Case law in Maryland is clear on this issue. Is the property truly suitable for a park or open space, or is the recommendation merely an expression of discord with the current use? We submit it is the latter.</p> <p>The owners operate a profitable, lawful non-conforming business on the site and it would be very difficult to relocate to any other property within close proximity of their existing location. To encourage abandonment of the non-conforming use it will be necessary to incentivize the owners through a favorable master plan recommendation that could facilitate an increase in the site's utility as well as monetary value.</p> <p>We recommend rezoning to the MXT zone to allow redevelopment as low-density multi-unit and townhouse residential development. If the Commission cannot support rezoning we ask you to limit the recommendation to acknowledging the existing lawful non-conforming use to re-confirming the R-60 residential zoning utilizing language similar to the Twinbrook Swimming Pool recommendation in Chapter 3 of the TNP. This makes it clear to prospective purchasers that the Site can lawfully be developed under the R-60 zoning thereby explicitly providing an alternative to the park/open space recommendation.</p> |
| Alison Moser  | <p>The social services tenants at Broome are not good neighbors and are not appropriate for a residential neighborhood. The community has requested that the County remove the services. Residents have repeatedly called the Police to deal with criminal activity. County has acknowledged problems and put in more security but the problems continue.</p>   |
| Michelle Harrigan,<br>Montgomery County Fire<br>and Rescue Services | <p>To meet the needs of the Twinbrook area over the next twenty years, including Twinbrook Station, EMS resources will likely need to be supplemented by additional units at surrounding fire-rescue stations. Likely an additional EMS unit will be needed at Rockville Station 23 to meet additional incident call load within the area. Unlikely that additional fire-rescue facilities will be needed within the Twinbrook area during the next twenty years but several of the area stations may require renovation/expansion. New high-rise residences increase population, resulting in increased EMS call load. Particular impact if the number of elderly residents is significant. Fire hazards greatly diminished by sprinkler, smoke/fire detection and smoke control systems.</p>  |

**TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN**  
**Summary of Written Comments Received**  
**Between January 31, 2008 and Close of Record, April 11, 2008**

| Name                                    | Summary of Comment   |
|---|--|
| Alison and Rick Moser                   | We have spoken and written about the unacceptability of the current social services located at the Broome site but we find that the TNP has not been altered. The residents have asked the City to advocate on our behalf to remove the social services from our neighborhood. The City should assist the residents by using the strongest possible language in the TNP to accurately reflect community sentiment.   |
| Christina Y. Ginsburg<br>President, TCA | The TCA has been closely following the TNP for nearly three years. Staff was instructed to make changes in the language of the Plan to discourage the continuation of the methadone clinic at Broome. At this time we have not seen the proposed language. This is one of many concerns TCA has with the TNP. Today is the last day to submit comments to the Planning Commission about the TNP.   |
| Jennifer D. Espinoza                    | Strongly disagree with the current plan language on the Broome site. I have had to call 911 because my two year old noticed a heavily intoxicated man passed out on our front lawn. He identified himself as from the Broome facilities. This was during the daytime security hours. This incident is only of many experiences of disruptive intoxicated behavior, stolen property, harassment etc. in our neighborhood. Please change the language to reflect our neighborhood concerns and safety.   |
| Jacquie Kubin                           | “First Do No Harm” should be part of our everyday morals and should be a guiding principal for all people to follow. The County did not consider those words when the decision was made to place a methadone clinic next to an elementary school. I drive Twinbrook Parkway almost daily and see seemingly disenfranchised individuals hanging out at bus stops. The Planning Commission to visit Broome between 9:00 a.m. and noon and the TNP should be changed to reflect community concerns.   |
| Dainia and Jonathan<br>Langsam          | We are Twinbrook residents, community participants and parents of three young children, and are very concerned with the current social service facilities located at Broome. We know that legally the County can do what it wants with the site, thus it is even more important that the City assist the neighborhood residents by using the strongest possible language in the Plan: please change the wording to accurately reflect community sentiment.   |
| Caryl McNeilly and<br>Robert Williamson | Tried to follow TNP process because it has an enormous impact on our future. Lived in Twinbrook in 1985 and have tried to contribute positively. We want to keep it as a place that offers a range of options, both entry-level and a place to grow and put down roots. Do not like many aspects of the TNP, nor the process. We attended a community meeting on a weekend and our sentiments were widely shared. Our main concern is the three commercial and/or industrial zones. We opposed mixed use and residential because it would alter the single-family nature of Twinbrook. Concerned about the proposed density at Twinbrook Station and in the Montgomery County portion of Twinbrook. Disagree |

**TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN**  
**Summary of Written Comments Received**  
**Between January 31, 2008 and Close of Record, April 11, 2008**

| Name  | Summary of Comment  |
|---|---|
|   | with the direction of changing Twinbrook from a neighborhood with green space and history to a higher density area like Arlington. Also concerned about restrictive nature of the TNP + RORZOR on expanding houses in Twinbrook. These houses were built to be customized. Restrictive language of new zoning ordinance and high-density rental orientation of the TNP suggest the City is trying to ghettoize Twinbrook as an entry-level transient area. Please address these deficiencies and preserve the neighborhood character.                                       |
| Kelly Silver                                | Please include me as a citizen who is against the current wording on the Broome site and the services located there. Please revise the current wording to relay the message that these services need to be moved asap.  |
| Christine Finney                            | Please change the TNP wording regarding the Broome site. The site has a great impact on our community: last year I was robbed, and my children were frightened, by one of the Broome "clients." The security is often not at Broome during the school hours and they do not follow the individual when they wander about. We have suffered harassment and these uses are not compatible with a residential community.   |
| Maria Elena Salientes                       | We have spoken about the unacceptability of the current social services at Broome but find that the TNP still contains the same language. Broome is a major problem and we have to call the police repeatedly. Our children cannot walk to Meadow Hall Elementary because of the situation at Broome, had to change our work schedules so that we can drop them off and pick them up. Other families have had to do the same. We know that the County can do what it wants but the City should assist the neighborhood by using the strongest language possible in the TNP. |
| Judy Miller<br>TNPAG, Vice President<br>TCA | Regarding the Taylor property: if anything were built there I would prefer it be townhomes rather than mixed use or apartments. It would be much more family friendly. If some sort of open space is there, safety should be reviewed: there have been incidents there. Fencing, hours of access and lighting would need to be considered.  |
| Michael Espinoza                            | I also strongly disagree with the current plan language on the Broome site. I have had to call 911 because my two year old noticed a heavily intoxicated man passed out on our front lawn. He identified himself as from the Broome facilities. This was during the daytime security hours. This incident is only of many experiences of disruptive intoxicated behavior, stolen property, harassment etc. in our neighborhood. Please change the language to reflect our neighborhood concerns and safety.   |
| Mary Ann Barnes                             | What does the County Executive wish to do with the former Broome Junior High School site? More residential and mixed-use? No mention of returning it to a public school. It should designated for residential housing for retired public school teachers, who have served their Maryland school district 25 years or more and retired in good standing.   |